DHP-REPAIR-001

The Trauma Overwrite Formula

A framework for understanding and re-filing persistent trauma responses

Luke Doel | DHP Framework | 2025

Abstract

Trauma is commonly understood as a wound — something done to a person that leaves a permanent mark. This paper proposes a different architectural model: trauma as a misfiled data packet. The event is real. The damage is real. But the persistence of trauma symptoms is not caused by the event itself — it is caused by the way the event was filed in memory, and the ongoing permission that filing gives the past to drive present behaviour.

Drawing on the 8 Archetype model of human cognition (Doel, 2025) and supported by existing neuroscientific research into memory reconsolidation, PTSD, and the neurobiology of threat response, this paper presents a four-step framework — DHP-REPAIR-001 — for identifying, intercepting, and re-labelling persistent trauma responses. The framework applies across a spectrum of trauma severity, from low-level conditioned shame responses to complex PTSD arising from combat, sexual assault, and prolonged abuse.

I. The Architecture of Trauma

1.1 What trauma actually is

Trauma is not the event. Trauma is what the brain does with the event.

When a person experiences a genuinely threatening event — physical danger, sexual violation, combat, abandonment, severe humiliation — the brain's threat-response system (centred in the amygdala) files the experience under a specific category: ongoing critical threat. This is adaptive. In the moment, it is the correct response. The nervous system mobilises all available resources to survive.

The problem is what happens afterwards. In a healthy resolution, the prefrontal cortex — the brain's executive function centre, what this framework calls the Speaker — processes the event, updates the threat assessment, and re-files the memory as: past event, resolved, no longer active. The nervous system returns to baseline.

In trauma, this re-filing does not happen. The memory remains categorised as ongoing critical threat. The Archivist — the memory system — continues to retrieve it with that label intact. Every retrieval re-triggers the threat response in the body. The Lost Child — the vulnerability module — receives the alarm signal and responds as if the original event is still occurring. The Speaker watches helplessly or is bypassed entirely.

This is not weakness. This is neurology. The brain is doing exactly what it was designed to do. It simply never received the signal that the threat has passed.

1.2 What existing research tells us

This model is supported by three converging bodies of neuroscientific research:

Memory reconsolidation research (Nader, Schafe & LeDoux, 2000; Ecker, Ticic & Hulley, 2012) demonstrates that memories are not fixed recordings. Every time a memory is retrieved, it becomes temporarily malleable — capable of being updated before it is re-stored. This is the neurological basis for the overwrite. The window during which a memory is active is also the window during which its emotional charge can be modified.

PTSD neurobiology research (van der Kolk, 2014; Porges, 2011) shows that severe trauma structurally alters the prefrontal cortex, reducing its capacity to regulate the amygdala's threat signals. In plain terms: repeated or severe trauma weakens the Speaker's ability to intercept the alarm. This explains why willpower alone cannot resolve severe trauma — the intercept mechanism itself has been damaged.

Polyvagal theory (Porges, 2011) establishes that the nervous system must reach a state of sufficient regulation before higher cognitive processing — including memory re-filing — is possible. A dysregulated nervous system cannot run the overwrite. Stabilisation is a prerequisite, not a luxury.

van der Kolk, B. (2014). The Body Keeps the Score. Viking.

Nader, K., Schafe, G.E. & LeDoux, J.E. (2000). Fear memories require protein synthesis in the amygdala for reconsolidation after retrieval. Nature, 406, 722-726.

Ecker, B., Ticic, R. & Hulley, L. (2012). Unlocking the Emotional Brain. Routledge.

Porges, S.W. (2011). The Polyvagal Theory. Norton.

II. The Trauma Overwrite Formula — DHP-REPAIR-001

The formula does not erase the memory. It changes the metadata — the label the Archivist has attached to the file. The event stays in the record. The ongoing permission it has been given to drive present behaviour is revoked.

The four steps map directly onto the 8 Archetype model. Each step activates a specific archetype to perform a specific function in the re-filing process.

STEP 1	**The Projector Scan — Identification** The Projector monitors the internal environment for the signal that the Archivist is uploading a Legacy Pain Packet. The signal is physical first: the pit in the stomach, the heat in the chest, the spike of anxiety that precedes conscious awareness. Most people skip this step because they are already inside the Lost Child response before they notice it has begun. The Projector's job is to catch it earlier — to notice the signal before it becomes a reaction. *The command: "Warning: Archivist is attempting to upload a Legacy Pain Packet. I see you."*
STEP 2	**The Speaker Intercept — The Firewall** Once the signal is identified, the Speaker steps in before the Thespian begins performing the emotion or the Entropist begins reacting with chaos. The Speaker

names the source. Not 'I am sad' but 'the teacher at 14 is uploading.' Not 'I am ashamed' but 'this is an old packet from a defective kernel.' Naming activates the prefrontal cortex and interrupts the automatic route from Archivist to Lost Child. This is the neurological equivalent of catching the file mid-transfer.

The command: "I acknowledge this data exists. I revoke its permission to drive the system today."

STEP 3

The Archivist Re-Labelling — The Overwrite

This is the core of the formula. The memory is retrieved — deliberately, with the Speaker online and the nervous system sufficiently regulated — and the metadata is changed. The old label ('ongoing threat / I was wrong / their verdict on me is valid') is replaced with a new label ('past event / source was a defective kernel / their output was corrupted data not accurate assessment'). The memory is then re-stored with the new label. Research into memory reconsolidation confirms that this window of retrieval is precisely when emotional charge can be modified and re-stored differently.

The command: "This is Legacy Data. The source was defective. I am re-filing this now."

STEP 4

The Moralist Validation — The Truth Mesh

The Moralist runs an evidence-based audit on the re-filed memory. Did I cause harm? Was the source of this packet operating from a defective kernel? Is their verdict on my value accurate data or corrupted output? The Moralist is the internal Truth Mesh — it evaluates evidence not narrative. If the source was a defective kernel (an abuser, a neglectful parent, a rigid institution, a person in their own unprocessed pain), their assessment of the node they harmed is invalid data. It does not count toward an accurate reading of that node's value.

The command: "Their kernel was defective. Their packets are invalid. I return their verdict to sender."

III. Severity and Scale

3.1 The formula applies across the full spectrum

The mechanism is identical regardless of trauma severity. What changes is the conditions required to run it safely.

For low-to-moderate trauma — conditioned shame responses, single-incident humiliation, early criticism from authority figures — the formula can often be run independently with sufficient self-awareness and a regulated nervous system. The Speaker is intact enough to intercept. The Archivist re-labelling can be done in reflection or journaling.

For moderate-to-severe trauma — complex PTSD, repeated childhood abuse, sexual assault, significant loss — additional conditions are required:

- Nervous system stabilisation first. The Speaker cannot intercept from inside a full threat response. Somatic regulation — breath, movement, body-based practices — must precede cognitive processing. This is why purely talk-based approaches fail for severe trauma: they attempt Step 2 without completing Step 1.
- A regulated witness. For trauma involving profound shame or violation, the Moralist audit cannot always be run alone. The shame is too deeply embedded in the Archivist's labelling. A stable, non-judgemental external presence — a therapist, a trusted person — provides a second Truth Mesh to help hold the re-filing process.
- Repetition. The Archivist has been reinforcing the original label for months or years. A single run of the formula does not overwrite decades of retrieval. The new label must be reinforced across multiple retrievals before it becomes the default.

3.2 Combat trauma and sexual assault

These represent the highest severity of application. The formula does not minimise what happened. It does not ask the survivor to forgive, forget, or reframe the event as acceptable. The event is logged in the Archivist's records permanently. It happened. It was real. It was wrong.

What the formula addresses is the ongoing permission the event has been given to drive present behaviour. A combat veteran who witnessed the death of colleagues is not misfiring because they are weak. Their Archivist filed the event correctly at the time — ongoing critical threat, maximum alarm. The formula's job is not to pretend the event was not catastrophic. It is to update the file: the threat is no longer active. The node survived. The colleagues who did not survive are not evidence of the node's failure — they are evidence of what war does to human beings.

For sexual assault survivors, the Moralist validation step is often the most critical and the most obstructed. Trauma from sexual violence is frequently filed by the Archivist with a corrupted label: I caused this. I should have prevented this. I am diminished by this. These labels are not the survivor's own assessment — they are the corrupted output of a defective kernel that was projected onto them. The Moralist's job is to run the evidence: the defective kernel caused the harm. The survivor's value was never altered by what a defective kernel did to them.

This step often requires a witness. The shame is too loud for the internal Moralist to override alone. This is the clinical rationale for trauma-informed therapy — not to provide answers, but to be a stable, regulated presence while the survivor's own Moralist runs the audit with enough support to complete it.

IV. What this framework is not

This framework is not a replacement for professional mental health support for severe trauma. For complex PTSD, trauma-informed therapy — EMDR, somatic experiencing, IFS — provides the regulated environment and skilled witness that the formula requires at high severity levels.

It is not a bypass. The pain of re-filing is real. The formula does not promise that the process is comfortable. It promises that the process has an end — that the file can be re-labelled, that the ongoing permission can be revoked, that the energy currently consumed by the running loop can be returned to the system.

It is not a verdict on the people who caused the harm. The formula uses the language of defective kernels not to dehumanise abusers or reduce complex human behaviour to a simple label, but to make a specific point: a person operating from their own unprocessed trauma, their own corrupted

code, their own defensive architecture — their output about another person's value is not reliable data. It is the output of a broken system. It does not have to be accepted as truth.

V. Summary

Trauma persists not because the event was too large to survive — the node survived it — but because the memory was filed under the wrong label and never updated. The Archivist keeps retrieving it as current threat. The Lost Child keeps responding to an alarm that no longer reflects present reality. The Speaker never gets the chance to close the loop.

DHP-REPAIR-001 is a four-step process for re-filing the packet:

- The Projector catches the signal before it becomes a reaction.
- The Speaker intercepts and names the source.
- The Archivist re-labels the memory from ongoing threat to past event, source identified.
- The Moralist validates: the source was defective. Their verdict is invalid data.

The event stays in the record. The trigger is disconnected. The energy is returned to the present.

This applies across the full spectrum of trauma severity, with the understanding that higher severity requires nervous system stabilisation and an external witness before the formula can run cleanly. The mechanism is the same. The conditions for running it safely vary with the depth of the original filing.

The world is full of people running Legacy Pain Packets from defective kernels that were never theirs to carry. This formula is the End Task command.

References

van der Kolk, B. (2014). The Body Keeps the Score: Brain, Mind, and Body in the Healing of Trauma. Viking.

Nader, K., Schafe, G.E. & LeDoux, J.E. (2000). Fear memories require protein synthesis in the amygdala for reconsolidation after retrieval. Nature, 406, 722-726.

Ecker, B., Ticic, R. & Hulley, L. (2012). Unlocking the Emotional Brain: Eliminating Symptoms at Their Roots Using Memory Reconsolidation. Routledge.

Porges, S.W. (2011). The Polyvagal Theory: Neurophysiological Foundations of Emotions, Attachment, Communication, and Self-Regulation. Norton.

Shapiro, F. (2018). Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) Therapy: Basic Principles, Protocols, and Procedures (3rd ed.). Guilford Press.

Levine, P.A. (2010). In an Unspoken Voice: How the Body Releases Trauma and Restores Goodness. North Atlantic Books.

Schwartz, R.C. (2021). No Bad Parts: Healing Trauma and Restoring Wholeness with the Internal Family Systems Model. Sounds True.

Doel, L. (2025). The 8 Archetypes of the Human Mind. Unpublished framework.